

REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner objects to the specification as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, objects to claims 97-115 because of alleged minor informalities; rejects claims 97-115 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement; rejects claims 97-115 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention; rejects claims 97-115 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,683,870 to Archer (hereinafter "ARCHER") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,608,455 to McNair (hereinafter "McNAIR"); rejects claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,644; rejects claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,993; rejects claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644; rejects claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,386; rejects claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,620; rejects claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,661; rejects claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No.

6,598,167; rejects claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708; rejects claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-73 of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498; rejects claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,229; rejects claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,376; rejects claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,571; and rejects claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,600. Applicants respectfully traverse these objections and these rejections.

By way of this Amendment, Applicants propose amending claims 97-115 to improve form. No new matter would be added by entry of the present Amendment. Claims 97-115 are pending.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objects to the specification for allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

a) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “enterprise communication network” recited in claim 97 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item

- a). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 97 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- b) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "object oriented protocol" recited in claim 97 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item b). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's allegation.

The terms "object oriented protocol" may correspond to, for example, a process employed in an object-oriented environment. Support for these terms can be found, for example, at p. 29, line 28 to p. 30, line 2 of the specification, which disclose:

More specifically, the client-tier software is created and 30 distributed as a set of Java classes including the applet classes to provide an industrial strength, object-oriented environment over the Internet.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the specification satisfies the written description requirement with respect to the phrase "object oriented protocol" as recited in claim 97.

- c) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "network entitlements" recited in claim 97 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item c). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 97 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- d) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "proxy generation" recited in claim 97 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item d). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 97 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- e) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "proxy request" recited in claim 97 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item e). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 97 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

- f) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “switched voice traffic resources” recited in claim 97 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item f). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 97 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- g) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “switched data traffic resources” recited in claim 97 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item g). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 97 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- h) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “switched toll free voice traffic resources” recited in claim 98 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item h). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 98 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- i) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “switched call center voice traffic resources” recited in claim 99 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item i). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 99 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- j) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “switched toll traffic” recited in claim 100 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item j). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 100 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- k) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “switched voice communications” recited in claim 101 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 2, item k).

Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 101 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

l) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "real time reporter" recited in claim 102 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item l). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 102 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

m) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "in-box manager application" recited in claim 105 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item m). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 105 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

n) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "priced call application" recited in claim 106 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item n). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 106 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

o) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "broadband view application" recited in claim 107 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item o). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 107 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

p) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "in-box application" recited in claim 108 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item p). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 108 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

- q) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “event monitor application” recited in claim 109 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item q). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 109 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- r) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “single order entry application” recited in claim 111 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item r). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 111 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- s) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “E-billing application” recited in claim 112 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item s). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 112 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- t) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “client view application” recited in claim 113 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item t). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 113 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- u) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “pre-selected calls” recited in claim 114 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item u). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 114 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- v) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “invoice generation” recited in claim 114 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item v). Without

acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 114 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

w) The Examiner alleges that the phrase "view application" recited in claim 115 is not supported by the specification (final Office Action, p. 3, item w). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 115 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the specification provides sufficient antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 97-115 stand objected to because of alleged minor informalities. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

The Examiner's alleges that the term "proxy request," previously recited in claims 97-101, 110, 112, and 115, is unclear (final Office Action, p. 3). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's allegation, Applicants propose amending claims 97-101, 110, 112, and 115 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 97-115 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph

Claims 97-115 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

- a) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “proxy generation” recited in claims 97, 110, and 115 is not disclosed in the original specification (final Office Action, p. 4). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants propose amending claims 97, 110, and 115 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- b) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “pre-selected calls” recited in claim 114 is not disclosed in the original specification (final Office Action, p. 4). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants propose amending claim 114 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.
- c) The Examiner alleges that the phrase “invoice generation” recited in claim 114 is not disclosed in the original specification (final Office Action, p. 4). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants propose amending claim 114 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 97-115, amended as proposed, meet the written description requirement. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-115 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph

Claims 97-115 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly failing particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to claims 97 and 110, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to determine the structure for the feature “after the customer’s

entitlements have been verified” (final Office Action, p. 5). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants propose amending claims 97 and 110 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

With respect to claims 97 and 110, the Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to determine the structure for the feature “providing session management for the customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements, and encryption” (final Office Action, p. 5). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s allegation.

At the outset, claims 97 and 110 do not recite “providing session management for the customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements, and encryption.” Rather, claims 97 and 110 recite “at least one secure web server that manages secure customer sessions over the public Internet, the at least one secure web server providing session management for the customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements and encryption.” Applicants have claimed the at least one secure web server in functional terms, as clearly permitted by at least M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(g). Contrary to the Examiner’s allegation, one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to determine, given the functional description, a structure of the recited secure web server. For example, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that a memory and a processor associated with the secure web server, where the memory contains instructions to execute the recited functions by the processor, would provide such a structure.

The Examiner further alleges that “the system comprising an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer

over the public Internet, the protocol invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, where the object oriented protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication, and network entitlements” refers to a workstation that is outside the system (final Office Action, p. 5). Without acquiescing in the Examiner’s allegation, Applicants propose amending claim 97 to address the Examiner’s concerns and in order to expedite prosecution.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 97-115, amended as proposed, are definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-115 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on ARCHER and MCNAIR

Claims 97-115 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over ARCHER in view of MCNAIR. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 97, amended as proposed, is directed to an integrated and secure system for conducting business over the public Internet by enabling a customer of a communications network to command and control the customer’s switched communications connections within the network over the public Internet and to view results of any changes in the customer’s connections over the public Internet. The system includes a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements; at least one

secure web server that manages secure customer sessions over the public Internet, the at least one secure web server providing session management for the customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements and encryption; and at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service; the plurality of system resources including a network manager which manages routing of the customer's traffic over the communications network, and a graphical user interface application to review network traffic, the network manager and the graphical user interface application responsive to messages from the dispatch server, where the network manager and the graphical user interface application command and control circuit networks provided by the communications network to the customer. ARCHER and MCNAIR, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose this combination of features.

For example, ARCHER and MCNAIR do not disclose a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed. The Examiner relies on IP Network 130; col. 7, line 64 to col. 8, line 11; item 134b; col. 8, lines 50-56; and col. 8, line 61 to col. 9, line 9 of ARCHER for allegedly

disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 7). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of ARCHER.

Col. 7, line 64 to col. 8, line 11 of ARCHER, which describe items 130 and 134b of ARCHER, disclose:

In FIG. 2, computer 134b is coupled to packet-switched network 130 through modem 140, circuit-switched network 136 and modem 142. This type of connection may be necessary when a user does not have direct access to a packet-switched network, for example a home PC. For the purpose of this invention, computer 134b is considered a digital device, even if modem 142 is an analog modem because from a logical viewpoint, computer 134b can be assigned an IP address and communicate with other components on the network 130 using the same protocol. An example of a computer 134b is a personal computer which includes a modem and executes a browser (e.g., Netscape Navigator or Microsoft Explorer) and is connected via telephone lines to an Internet service provider.

This section of ARCHER discloses a computer that executes a browser, which is coupled to a packet-switched network via telephone lines through a modem. This section of ARCHER does not disclose an object oriented protocol that supports encryption or entitlements. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 8, lines 50-56 of ARCHER disclose:

1. Using standard phone service and equipment 114, a caller dials a called party's find-me phone number (Step 102). This telephone number may be a specific phone number, either local or toll-free (e.g., 800 or 888 area code). Alternatively, multiple subscribers can share a single telephone number where each has a unique identification code which would be entered by the caller.

This section of ARCHER discloses that using standard phone service and equipment, a caller dials a party's find-me phone number, which may be a specific phone number,

either local or toll-free. Alternatively, multiple users can share a single phone number with a unique identification code. This section of ARCHER does not disclose an object oriented protocol that supports encryption or entitlements. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 8, line 61 to col. 9, line 9 of ARCHER disclose:

3. Follow-me server processor 128 performs a lookup to database 138 for the called party's designated destination numbers (Step 106). The database 138 has been set up beforehand by entering the TCP/IP based destination in the called party's profile. As discussed above, database 138 can be a standard database to store and retrieve phone number lists provided by the called party. The system should preferably support either static or dynamic addresses. In a static addressing scheme, each network interface is assigned a unique physical address. The address may be assigned by the hardware manufacturer or configured by the user. A dynamic addressing scheme provides a mechanism that automatically assigns a physical address to a station when the station first boots. In the embodiment illustrated in FIG. 2, database 138 would include telephone numbers for telephones 120a and 120b and IP addresses for computers 134a and 134b.

This section of ARCHER discloses that a follow-me processor performs a lookup to a database for the called party's designated destination numbers. The database has been set beforehand by entering the TCP/IP based destination in the called party's profile. The system supports both a static addressing scheme, in which each network interface is assigned a unique number, or a dynamic addressing scheme, in which a mechanism automatically assigns a physical address to a station when the station first boots. This section of ARCHER does not disclose an object oriented protocol that supports encryption or entitlements. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that

encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

MCNAIR does not overcome the deficiencies of ARCHER set forth above with respect to this feature of amended claim 97.

Furthermore, ARCHER and MCNAIR do not disclose at least one secure web server that manages secure customer sessions over the public Internet, the at least one secure web server providing session management for a customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements and encryption, as also recited in claim 97, amended as proposed. The Examiner relies on item 128a; col. 9, lines 31-37; col. 8, lines 50-56; and col. 8, line 61 to col. 9, line 9 of ARCHER for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 7). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of ARCHER.

Item 128a of ARCHER is described in col. 10, lines 45-55 of ARCHER, which disclose:

FIG. 6 also illustrates some of the variations discussed above but not shown in FIG. 2. For example, the computer system for server processor 128 is illustrated in three subsystems 128a, 128b, and 128c. Subsystem 128a is coupled to subsystem 128b through packet-switched network 130 and coupled to subsystem 128c through a separate network 144. In addition, database 138 is illustrated as being coupled to server processor 128 via packet-switched network 130. Finally, FIG. 6 shows a cellular communications system transmit/receive tower 146 coupled to PSTN 130 to transmit and receive signals to and from cellular phone 120.

This section of ARCHER discloses server processor 128, which includes subsystems 128a, 128b, and 128c. This section of ARCHER does not disclose that server processor subsystem 128a of ARCHER manages secure customer sessions over the public Internet and provides session management for a customer, the session management including

customer identification, validation, entitlements and encryption, as would be required by claim 97 based on the Examiner's interpretation of ARCHER. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose at least one secure web server that manages secure customer sessions over the public Internet, the at least one secure web server providing session management for a customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements and encryption, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 9, lines 31-37 of ARCHER disclose:

5. The first destination to answer initiates voice digitization at the server processor 128. Upon receipt of a pickup notification, server processor 128 will terminate the call notification to each of the other receiving devices 120, 134. An example of this step was described above with respect to steps 64 and 66 of FIG. 4. The connection can then be commenced.

This section of ARCHER discloses that the first destination to answer a call initiates voice digitization at a server processor. Upon receipt of a pickup notification, the server processor will terminate the call notification to each of the other receiving devices, after which the connection can be commenced. This section of ARCHER does not disclose a secure web server that manages secure customer sessions. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose at least one secure web server that manages secure customer sessions over the public Internet, the at least one secure web server providing session management for a customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements and encryption, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 8, lines 50-56 of ARCHER were reproduced above. This section of ARCHER discloses that using standard phone service and equipment, a caller dials a party's find-me phone number, which may be a specific phone number, either local or toll-free. Alternatively, multiple users can share a single phone number with a unique identification code. This section of ARCHER does not disclose a secure web server that

manages secure customer sessions. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose at least one secure web server that manages secure customer sessions over the public Internet, the at least one secure web server providing session management for a customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements and encryption, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 8, line 61 to col. 9, line 9 of ARCHER were reproduced above. This section of ARCHER discloses that a follow-me processor performs a lookup to a database for the called party's designated destination numbers. The database has been set beforehand by entering the TCP/IP based destination in the called party's profile. The system supports both a static addressing scheme, in which each network interface is assigned a unique number, or a dynamic addressing scheme, in which a mechanism automatically assigns a physical address to a station when the station first boots. This section of ARCHER does not disclose that server processor 128 of ARCHER manages secure customer sessions over the public Internet and provides session management for a customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements and encryption, as would be required by claim 97 based on the Examiner's interpretation of ARCHER. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose at least one secure web server that manages secure customer sessions over the public Internet, the at least one secure web server providing session management for a customer, the session management including customer identification, validation, entitlements and encryption, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

MCNAIR does not overcome the deficiencies of ARCHER set forth above with respect to this feature of claim 97, amended as proposed.

Moreover, ARCHER and MCNAIR do not disclose at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed. The Examiner relies on item 128b; items 140, 142, 146, 120, and 132; col. 8, line 61 to col. 9, line 9; and item 138 of ARCHER for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, pp. 7-8). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of ARCHER.

Items 128b, 140, 142, 146, 120, 132, and 138 appear in Fig. 6 of ARCHER, which is described in col. 10, lines 45-55 of ARCHER, which was reproduced above. This section of ARCHER discloses server processor 128, which includes subsystems 128a, 128b, and 128c. This section of ARCHER does not disclose that server processor subsystem 128b of ARCHER provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service, as would be required by claim 97 based on the Examiner's interpretation of ARCHER. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 8, line 61 to col. 9, line 9 of ARCHER were reproduced above. This section of ARCHER discloses that a follow-me processor performs a lookup to a database for the called party's designated destination numbers. The database has been set beforehand by

entering the TCP/IP based destination in the called party's profile. The system supports both a static addressing scheme, in which each network interface is assigned a unique number, or a dynamic addressing scheme, in which a mechanism automatically assigns a physical address to a station when the station first boots.

This section of ARCHER does not disclose that the follow-me processor of ARCHER provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service, as would be required by claim 97 based on the Examiner's interpretation of ARCHER. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

MCNAIR does not overcome the deficiencies of ARCHER set forth above with respect to this feature of amended claim 97.

Furthermore, ARCHER and MCNAIR do not disclose a plurality of system resources that include a network manager which manages routing of the customer's traffic over the communications network, and a graphical user interface application to review network traffic, the network manager and the graphical user interface application responsive to messages from the dispatch server, where the network manager and the graphical user interface application command and control circuit networks provided by the communications network to the customer, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed. The Examiner relies on item 140; col. 4, lines 17-30; col. 5, lines 47-58; col. 2,

lines 35-50; and col. 9, lines 62-67 of ARCHER for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 8). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of ARCHER.

Item 140 of ARCHER depicts a modem (see line 66 of col. 7 of ARCHER). Item 140 of ARCHER does not disclose a plurality of system resources that include a network manager which manages routing of the customer's traffic over the communications network, and a graphical user interface application to review network traffic, the network manager and the graphical user interface application responsive to messages from the dispatch server, where the network manager and the graphical user interface application command and control circuit networks provided by the communications network to the customer, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 4, lines 17-30 of ARCHER disclose:

A first embodiment system 110 of the present invention is illustrated in FIG. 2. Before turning to functional blocks of FIG. 2, however, it may be useful to provide a quick overview of the concept behind this embodiment. This embodiment of the present invention is based on Internet Protocol (IP) based voice traffic, where calls are: (1) converted from analog signal to digital signals, (2) split up into IP packets, (3) routed to their destination, and (4) reassembled. In the first embodiment, when an end user dials a single find-me number, the IP packets that make up the call are routed to a packet-switched network. Components within the network receive the header (call originate) and begin to search for a telephone number at which the person being called will answer.

This section of ARCHER discloses a system based on Internet Protocol based voice traffic, where calls are converted from analog to digital signals, split up into IP packets, routed to their destination, and reassembled. When an end user dials a single find-me number, the IP packets are routed to a packet-switched network. The components in the network receive the header and begin to search for a telephone number at which the person being called will answer. This section of ARCHER does not disclose a graphical user interface application and a network manager that command and control voice traffic

resources and data traffic resources. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose a plurality of system resources that include a network manager which manages routing of the customer's traffic over the communications network, and a graphical user interface application to review network traffic, the network manager and the graphical user interface application responsive to messages from the dispatch server, where the network manager and the graphical user interface application command and control circuit networks provided by the communications network to the customer, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 5, lines 47-48 of ARCHER disclose:

FIG. 3 illustrates a simplified block diagram of a converter 126. The converter receives telephone signals from circuit-switched network 118.

This section of ARCHER discloses a converter that receives telephone signals from a circuit-switched network. This section of ARCHER does not disclose a graphical user interface application and a network manager that command and control voice traffic resources and data traffic resources. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose a plurality of system resources that include a network manager which manages routing of the customer's traffic over the communications network, and a graphical user interface application to review network traffic, the network manager and the graphical user interface application responsive to messages from the dispatch server, where the network manager and the graphical user interface application command and control circuit networks provided by the communications network to the customer, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 2, lines 35-50 of ARCHER disclose:

In another aspect, the present invention provides a communication system in which a plurality of converters are each operable to sample voice signals and create digital packets that contain a

digital representation of the voice signals. Each converter might also create voice signals from a digital packet. A storage device contains a database of records each of which includes a call list of telephone numbers associated with each of a plurality of subscribers. The system also includes a computer system that operates under control of software. Upon receipt of a call notification, the software causes the computer system to query the database to retrieve a record associated with the call notification and to multicast digital call notification packets to a plurality of the converters. The digital notification packets include information relating to the call list of telephone numbers in the received record.

This section of ARCHER discloses a communication system in which a plurality of converters sample voice signals and create digital packets from the voice signals, and vice versa. A storage device contains a database of records that includes a call list of telephone numbers associated with subscribers, and a computer system that operates under the control of software. Upon receipt of a call notification, the software causes the computer system to query the database to retrieve a record associated with the call notification and to multicast digital call notification packets to a plurality of converters. This section of ARCHER does not disclose a graphical user interface application and a network manager that command and control voice traffic resources and data traffic resources. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose a plurality of system resources that include a network manager which manages routing of the customer's traffic over the communications network, and a graphical user interface application to review network traffic, the network manager and the graphical user interface application responsive to messages from the dispatch server, where the network manager and the graphical user interface application command and control circuit networks provided by the communications network to the customer, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

Col. 9, lines 62-67 of ARCHER disclose:

While described with respect to audio (e.g., voice), it is understood that data, video or combinations of all three could just as easily be used. Audio, data and video telephony over packet-switched networks is described in greater detail in co-pending application Ser. No. 08/751,205, which is incorporated herein by reference.

This section of ARCHER discloses that the system of ARCHER can use data, video, audio, or a combination of the three. This section of ARCHER does not disclose a graphical user interface application and a network manager that command and control voice traffic resources and data traffic resources. Therefore, this section of ARCHER does not disclose a plurality of system resources that include a network manager which manages routing of the customer's traffic over the communications network, and a graphical user interface application to review network traffic, the network manager and the graphical user interface application responsive to messages from the dispatch server, where the network manager and the graphical user interface application command and control circuit networks provided by the communications network to the customer, as recited in claim 97, amended as proposed.

MCNAIR does not overcome the deficiencies of ARCHER set forth above with respect to this feature of amended claim 97.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 97 is patentable over ARCHER and MCNAIR, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 97 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on ARCHER and MCNAIR be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 98-109 depend from claim 97. Therefore, these claims are patentable over ARCHER and MCNAIR, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 97. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 98-109 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on ARCHER and MCNAIR be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claims 110 and 115, amended as proposed, recite features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, feature discussed above with respect to claim 97. Therefore, these claims are patentable over ARCHER and MCNAIR, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 97. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 110 and 115 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on ARCHER and MCNAIR be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 111-114 depend from claim 110. Therefore, these claims are patentable over ARCHER and MCNAIR, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 110. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 111-114 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on ARCHER and MCNAIR be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting

In making an obviousness-type double patenting rejection, the Examiner should make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims – a claim in one patent application compared to a claim in the other patent application; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the a claim of the other patent application (see M.P.E.P § 804). In the final Office Action, the Examiner does not provide sufficient evidence to support the obviousness-type double patenting rejections.

1) Pending claims 97-115 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,644. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, pp. 13-14):

The '644 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the "Internet," claim 1), at least one secure web server ("at least one authentication secure server," claim 1), at least one dispatch server ("a dispatch server," claim 1), a network manager ("outbound network manager," claim 1), and a view application (on "network configuration device," claim 1). Claim 1 of the '644 patent contains additional elements (i.e. application secure server) not needed to anticipate the instant claims. However, Applicants have used the term "comprising" in their current claims which allows for additional elements to be present.

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the dispatch server recited in claim 1 of the '644 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,644. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements." The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,644 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,381,644; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,644, as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,644 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

2) Pending claims 97-115 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,993. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 14):

The '993 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the "Internet," claim 1), at least one secure web server ("at least one authentication secure server," claim 1), at least one dispatch server ("a dispatch server," claim 1), a network manager ("outbound network manager," claim 1), and a view application (on "network configuration device," claim 1). Also, the '993 patent contains extra limitations not required in the instant application.

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the dispatch server recited in claim 1 of the '993 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,993. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of

system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements." The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,993 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,377,993; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,993, as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,993 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

3) Pending claims 97-115 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 14):

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only substantive difference between the two sets of claims in relation to the type of communication supported (voice or data), which would be an obvious modification.

Applicants submit that this allegation is in no way sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. In addition, Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites “at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer’s entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service.” Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites “a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements.” The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644, as set forth in M.P.E.P § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,644 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

4) Pending claims 97-114 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,386. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, pp. 14-15):

The '386 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the "Internet," claim 1), at least one secure web server ("at least one secure server," claim 1), at least one dispatch server ("a device for generating statistical data," claim 1), a network manager ("customer," claim 8), and a view application (on "a retrieval device," claim 1). In the '386 patent, the customer has to manually route the traffic. "[P]roviding an automatic or mechanical means to replace a manual activity which accomplished the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art" (MPEP 2144.04 III).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97 is an obvious variant of a device for generating statistical data, as recited in claim 1 of the '644 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,386. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation

associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements.” The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,386 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,470,386; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,386, as set forth in M.P.E.P § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,386 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

5) Pending claims 97-114 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,620. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 15):

The ‘620 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the “Internet,” claim 1), at least one secure web server (“at least one secure server,” claim 1), at least one dispatch server (“a device for receiving network information,” claim 1), a network manager (“a device for periodically polling network switches,” claim 1), and a view application (on “integrated interface,” claim 1).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the device for receiving network information recited in claim 1 of the ‘620 patent. Applicants submit that the

claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,620. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites “at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer’s entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service.” Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites “a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements.” The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,620 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,490,620; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,620, as set forth in M.P.E.P § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,620 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

6) Pending claims 97-115 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,661. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 15):

The '661 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the "Internet," claim 1), at least one secure web server ("at least one secure server," claim 1), at least one dispatch server ("a network configuration system," claim 1), a network manager ("a network manager," claim 1), and a view application (on "integrated interface," claim 1).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the network configuration system recited in claim 1 of the '661 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,661. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements." The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,661 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,574,661; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,661, as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,661 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

7) Pending claims 97-114 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,167. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, pp. 15-16):

The '167 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the "Internet," claim 1), at least one secure web server ("at least one secure server," claim 1), at least one dispatch server ("at least one dispatcher server," claim 1), a network manager ("system resources providing communications network management," claim 1), and a view application (on "integrated interface," claim 1).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the at least one dispatcher server recited in claim 1 of the '167 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,167. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources,

provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements." The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,167 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,598,167; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,167, as set forth in M.P.E.P § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,167 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

8) Pending claims 97-115 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 16):

The '708 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the "Internet," claim 1), at least one secure web server ("at least one secure server," claim 1), at least one dispatch server ("at least one dispatcher server," claim 1), a network manager ("system resources providing communications network management," claim 1), and a view application (on "system resources...generate client data," claim 1).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the at least one dispatcher server recited in claim 1 of the '708 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements." The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude

that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708, as set forth in M.P.E.P § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

9) Pending claims 97-115 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-73 of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 16):

The '498 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the "Internet," claim 1), at least one secure web server ("a secure server," claim 68), at least one dispatch server ("a configuring device," claim 68), a network manager ("a configuring device," claim 1), and a view application (on "configuring device," claim 68).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the configuring device recited in claim 68 of the '498 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between

the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements.” The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498, as set forth in M.P.E.P § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,498 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

10) Pending claims 97-114 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,229. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, pp. 15-16):

The ‘229 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the “Internet,” claim 1), at least one secure web server (“at least one secure server,” claim 1), at least one dispatch server (“an invoice server device,” claim 1), a network manager (“an invoice presentation device,” claim 1), and a view application (on “presentation applet,” claim 1).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one

dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the invoice server device recited in claim 1 of the '229 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,229. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements." The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,229 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,745,229; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,229, as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,229 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

11) Pending claims 97-115 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,376. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 17):

The '376 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the "Internet," claim 1), at least one secure web server ("at least one web server," claim 1), at least one dispatch server ("at least one dispatch server," claim 1), a network manager ("system resources providing communications network management," claim 1), and a view application (on "system resource....generate client data," claim 1).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the at least one dispatch server recited in claim 1 of the '376 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,376. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification,

authentication and entitlements.” The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,376 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,763,376; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,376, as set forth in M.P.E.P § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,376 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

12) Pending claims 97-115 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,571. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 17):

The ‘571 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the “Internet,” claim 1), at least one secure web server (“at least one secure server,” claim 1), at least one dispatch server (“at least one dispatcher server,” claim 1), a network manager (“system resources providing communications network management,” claim 1), and a view application (on “system resources...generate client data,” claim 1).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the at least one dispatcher server recited in claim 1 of the ‘571 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,986,571.

For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites “at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer’s entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service.” Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites “a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements.” The claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,571 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 6,968,571; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,571, as set forth in M.P.E.P § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-115 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,571 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

13) Pending claims 97-114 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,600. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges (final Office Action, pp. 17-18):

The '600 patent contains, an object oriented protocol (IP on the "Internet," claim 1), at least one secure web server ("at least one secure server," claim 1), at least one dispatch server ("at least one dispatch server," claim 1), a network manager ("system resources providing communications management," claim 1), and a view application (on "system resources...generate client data," claim 1).

Applicants submit that this allegation is not sufficient for establishing a proper case of double patenting. For example, the Examiner has not explained how the at least one dispatch server, as recited in claim 97, is an obvious variant of the at least one dispatch server recited in claim 1 of the '600 patent. Applicants submit that the claims of the present application are not obvious variants of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,600. For example, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "at least one dispatch server that communicates with the at least one secure web server and a plurality of system resources, provides verification of system access and verification of the customer's entitlements, and forwards messages to a proxy associated with a desired service." Furthermore, claim 97, amended as proposed, recites "a web-based delivery system that delivers to the customer an object oriented protocol that encrypts interactive communications between the system and the customer over the public Internet, where the protocol is configured to be invoked within a web browser executed by a workstation associated with the customer, and where the protocol supports encryption, customer identification, authentication and entitlements." The claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,600 do not recite at least these features.

If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make clear (a) the differences between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims, by comparing each claim in the present application to a claim in U.S. Patent No. 7,058,600; and (b) the reasons why a person of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the invention defined in the claim at issue would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,600, as set forth in M.P.E.P. § 804.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 97-114 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,600 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing proposed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the proposed pending claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendment because the amendment does not raise new issues or require a further search of the art. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendment places the present application in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that entry of this proposed amendment would place the application in better form for appeal in the event that the application is not allowed.

As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions (e.g.,

whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons to modify a reference and/or to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: /Viktor Simkovic, Reg. No. 56,012/
Viktor Simkovic
Reg. No. 56,012

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800
CUSTOMER NUMBER: 25537
Date: May 14, 2009